

INDIA'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Government of India appears to be playing a game of nuclear chicken with the United States. In the past 3 months India has: Prepared for nuclear testing, tested for eventual deployment of the medium-range Prithvi missile, capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and repudiated the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

While India—under great pressure from the United States and the lender nations—reluctantly decided to refrain from nuclear testing for the time being, it is planning to go ahead with testing and deployment of its medium-range Prithvi missile, possibly even as we meet here today. The United States has urged India not to proceed with the deployment of the Prithvi missiles because deployment could increase tensions between India and Pakistan, the only nation within logistical range of this new Indian offensive weapons system. The United States has urged restraint in missile development and deployment on the subcontinent as we continue our efforts to reduce tensions and slow the arms buildup.

One hears all kinds of rather lame excuses for India's potential Prithvi deployment. The Indian Government would lead us to believe that deployment is being done in response to internal domestic political pressure. Issues that affect the security and safety of an entire subcontinent, such as nuclear and missile proliferation, cannot and should not be equated with political expediency. The internal political pressures cannot be carelessly applied when the result of those pressures is a direct threat to Pakistan's security. And surely if this rationale for nuclear provocation is good for the goose, will it not soon become equally good for the gander?

Mr. Speaker, since 1974 India has freely pursued its nuclear program. Pakistan, on the other hand has been severely penalized: for 10 years Pakistan has endured the Pressler sanctions that have adversely affected Pakistan's conventional defense. Yet Pakistan has consistently supported the elimination of nuclear weapons in the region. Since 1974 Pakistan has proposed to India the establishment of a nuclear weapons free zone in south Asia (1974); a joint Indo-Pakistan declaration renouncing the acquisition and manufacture of nuclear weapons (1978); mutual inspections by India and Pakistan of nuclear facilities (1979); simultaneous adherence to the NPT by India and Pakistan (1979); simultaneous acceptance of full-scope IAEA safeguards (1979); agreement on a bilateral or regional nuclear test ban treaty (1987); commencement of a multilateral conference on the nuclear proliferation in south Asia (1991); and creation of a missile-free zone in south Asia (1993).

All of these proposals have been rejected by India.

Mr. Speaker, if Pakistan and India are ever to resolve the differences between them it must be done through confidence-building measures, not through an arms race or nuclear contest. Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto of Pakistan and her predecessors have made a series of good faith gestures, and have put significant non-proliferation proposals on the

table. Pakistan has demonstrated significant restraint in its own sophisticated technological program. It is long time that such restraint be matched by India, and that India respond substantively to the arms reduction proposals that have been promulgated by Islamabad. And above all, Mr. Speaker, this is hardly the right time or the right circumstances for a major provocation such as the deployment of the Indian Prithvi program.

I urge the President and the Secretary of State to use their good offices to have New Delhi take positive steps forward, not dangerous steps backward.

HONORING DR. DUANE R. BROWN

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise before my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize Duane Brown, Ph.D. Dr. Brown is retiring today after almost 29 years in the field of education.

Dr. Brown began his career in 1957 in the Flint community schools. Starting out as a community school director he quickly showed he understood the importance of the community's role in the education of the students. He worked tirelessly with the parents and other community members to insure that each and every child had the best education possible. He worked with numerous organizations throughout the community to provide whatever services the residents of the community needed, whether that person was a student, parent or member of the community. At various stages in Dr. Brown's career he served as a principal and a director of elementary education. While serving as principal at Williams Community Education Center; he was responsible for the coordination of a comprehensive elementary school, recreational center, and facility offering health and other needed community services to the students and residents of the area; a true full service school.

In 1978, Dr. Brown began serving as executive director of the National Center for Community Education. It was through this center that Dr. Brown continued his mission by traveling to nearly every State in our great Nation and several foreign countries to conduct workshops for educators and parents on the benefits of community education. Additionally, many thousands of people have traveled from all over the world to the National Center and the Flint School District to learn more about community education. It was through these opportunities that many participants came to realize the dream that Charles Stewart Mott and Frank Manley had many years ago, when they looked around the Flint community at the many empty school buildings commenting and dreaming about all of the wonderful clubs for the young people.

Mr. Speaker, Duane R. Brown is one of those educators that each of us as parents hope our children have the opportunity to become acquainted with because he cares. It is with great pleasure that I stand before you today to ask you and my fellow members of the 104th Congress to join me in paying tribute to a individual who certainly made his community a better place for all because he was there.

IN COMMEMORATION OF KINDNESS WEEK

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Kindness Foundation of Dallas, TX, and to praise their efforts to establish the week of February 11–18, 1996, as Kindness Week in Texas.

The Kindness Foundation's mission is to improve the quality of life throughout Dallas, and challenge every city in the United States to encourage intentional acts of kindness among all of its citizens.

The Foundation was founded by Dee Silverstein and Jackie Waldman of Dallas after they were inspired by the movie, *Schindler's List*. Silverstein and Waldman were struck by the impact that one committed individual could make in the world. They realized that they too could make a difference and sought the counsel of the late James C. McCormick, a best-selling author and prominent Dallas area businessman and city leader; together the three enlisted the help of other committed Texans to form Dallas Acts Kind, the grassroots group that organized Kindness Week '95.

The Dallas mayor endorsed the idea and declared February 12–18 1995, Dallas Acts Kind Week. The first week of its kind, the event was a huge success. Activities included a Kindness Youth Rally for 16,000 area seventh and eighth graders with a message to make kindness a way of life, an All-City Rally promoting racial harmony and religious tolerance, and a gathering in Thanks-Giving Square to celebrate unity.

As a result of Dallas Acts Kind Week '95, a Universal Prayer was written by leaders of the three monotheistic religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

In addition, the success of last year's event prompted Dr. Don Benton, a pastor in the United Methodist Church, to accept a calling to serve as the first president of The Kindness Foundation.

For 1996, a special task force has been coordinating the efforts of more than 100 volunteers in planning for Kindness Week '96. Thus far, events will include a youth rally designed to promote kindness as a strength, the planting of the first "Kindness Tree," an interfaith service, a free showing of *Schindler's List*, an evening of multicultural family entertainment, and a city-wide rally organized to foster oneness.

The Kindness Foundation was created by three caring individuals who were committed to make their community a better place in which to live. Since then, many more have joined them in this worthy cause. It is now up to all of us to participate in the effort to spread kindness in the course of our daily lives. After all, we all share the responsibility in building nurturing and supportive communities.

THE 104TH CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday,

January 10, 1996, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

It is hard to remember a busier session of Congress than the first year of the 104th Congress in 1995. The House was in session through Christmas, and cast over 880 votes. But is also true that the achievements of the first session are meager. Even the strongest champions of the first session admit the sparse results and say the session made history but not laws.

CONGRESSIONAL AGENDA

The new congressional leadership certainly defined the debate during 1995 and they deserve credit for making a start on the central question of balancing the federal budget by the year 2002. Major progress was made in reducing the deficit and trimming the size of government in the first two years of the Clinton Administration, and the new congressional leadership is building on those achievements. The issue now is not whether the budget should be balanced, but how; and not whether federal responsibilities should be devolved to the states, but which ones. I voted for a seven-year balanced budget, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and a line-item veto.

Some of the major achievements of the session came on issues that transcended partisan politics. Congress, with my support, passed long delayed legislation to tighten registration and disclosure rules for lobbyists; banned virtually all gifts to lawmakers, including expensive paid trips to resorts; required Congress to abide by federal workplace laws; and limited the imposition of unfunded mandates on states and localities.

The congressional leadership has brought about major changes in the manner Congress operates. Speaker Gingrich has centralized power in his office, at the expense of the committee system. For the most part, he has simply bypassed the slow process of congressional hearings and committee work, and attempted to use spending bills to make changes in policy. He has succeeded in keeping a remarkable level of discipline in his caucus.

FAILURES

Even so, the ambitions of the new House leadership have outstripped its achievements

and left one of the least productive sessions in modern history in terms of the number of laws enacted. The most important piece of legislation—a huge omnibus bill calling for reform of hundreds of programs and a seven year plan to balance the budget—remains stalled in negotiations with the White House. In all, 67 bills were enacted into law in 1995, by far the lowest number for a first session of Congress since the end of World War II. Among them are six of the 13 annual appropriations bills funding the operations of the government that should have been passed by October 1, 1995.

The list of items under the Contract with America not passed is extensive. It includes a balanced budget amendment, a line item veto, crime bill, welfare reform, tax cuts, national security measures, deregulation, litigation restraints, and term limits. Speaker Gingrich was able to get most of his Contract through the House with ease, but came up hard against the unique role that the Constitution gives to the Senate. The Senate traditionally serves as a break on the excesses of the House. The revolutionary zeal that has often marked the Republicans in the House still courses through the House, but the Senate has proved to be far more cautious and skeptical, slowing some measures and blocking others.

This has been a special-interest driven Congress. I suppose that's always true to some extent, but the new Republican leadership, while vowing to end it, just came up with a new list of political winners and losers. The working poor have certainly been on the wrong side of their list; the wealthy on the right side. It is one thing to run on a promise of curbing all government entitlements to everyone but quite another to target lower income working Americans for a disproportionate share of the cuts. Many members came to Congress this year to shake up Washington, but they have become among the leaders in campaign contributions from special interests. As a remedy, I support sweeping campaign finance reform, and will urge its consideration this year.

LACK OF CIVILITY

The congressional session was as contentious as I can remember, epitomized by the bitter fight over the budget that closed the

government for 21 days—a record—and kept Congress in session over Christmas for the first time in 15 years, and reached new heights for vituperative debate.

I have seen more flat-out partisanship in the House this year than ever before. It spreads from the floor to the committees, which were once largely free of it, and certainly to the television cameras. There have been shouting and shoving matches on and off the House floor and harsh partisan and personal attacks.

RETIREMENTS

There's not much doubt that Congress is going through a real shakeout. So far, 24 members of the House and 12 members of the Senate have announced their retirements, with another 10 House members running for higher office. Many have talked about the very long hours and demanding schedule. Others have cited the extreme partisanship. Still others have said they simply want to pursue other career opportunities, and spend more time with their families.

Change and turnover can be beneficial as new members bring fresh energy and new ideas to the institution. Congress, however, also benefits from the leadership and experience of veteran legislators, who know how to build consensus and make the legislative process work. My concern is that so many retirements come from the political center of both parties. Moderates are where most of the American people are on issues. What we need in Congress and government today is a dynamic center that represents and responds to the needs and concerns of the average American, not special interests on the right and left.

CONCLUSION

My own guess is that, under the present balance of forces in the White House and Congress, all of the questions on the budget and the role of government will not be resolved completely. We can reasonably expect incremental changes, rather than revolution. Nobody knows, of course, what happens to the Republican proposals in the days ahead. Many of the questions, unsettled in 1995, may be resolved in 1996.